

a'   
 concl.   
a currency note validator having a microcontroller capable of receiving  
identification information from the identification adapter;

a storage mechanism having a non-volatile, integral storage memory capable of  
receiving and storing information output from the currency note validator; and

a detachable soft count supervisor comprising a computer capable of  
interrogating and extracting the information from the non-volatile storage memory of the  
storage mechanism and providing spread sheet data manipulation of the extracted  
information.

18. (Amended) A method for tracking the operation of a currency validation  
system comprising the steps of:

storing a unique serial number in an identification adapter;

communicating the unique serial number to a currency validator having a  
microcontroller;

communicating performance information from the currency validator to a  
nonvolatile memory within a storage mechanism; and

communicating the performance information from the nonvolatile memory of the  
storage mechanism to a soft count supervisor, the soft count supervisor including a  
computer capable of producing spread sheet data.

### REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 251 as being based upon a defective reissue declaration. The Examiner rejected claims 8-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph because the specification is non-enabling. The Examiner rejected claims 8-17 under 35 U.S.C.

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

§ 112, second paragraph as being vague and indefinite. Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lucero et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,072,930; hereafter Lucero).

The Examiner stated that a request to transfer drawings from the original patent was not made, and further provided Form PTO-948 indicating the Draftperson's objections to the drawings. However, because the submitted drawings (e.g., Fig. 2) are not the same as the patent drawings and the PTO has eliminated the practice of transferring drawings from the patent to the reissue application, Applicants will submit formal drawings that address the objections upon allowance of the application.

The Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-23 as being based upon a defective reissue declaration. The Examiner asserts that the claims filed in the original application included method claims that were subsequently cancelled after the first action on the merits. While Applicants agree that the original application contained method claims, these canceled claims were not commensurate in scope with the patented claims. Thus, according to MPEP § 1402, failure to draft method claims commensurate in scope to the allowed apparatus claims constitutes an error in conduct. Therefore, the reason for reissue as stated in the reissue oath/declaration is sufficient.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 8-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner contends that the specification, while enabling for the soft count supervisor comprising a computer that "provides spread sheet type accounting of notes and coupons," does not reasonably provide enablement for the "soft count supervisor comprising a computer and a program for providing a spread sheet output." However, Applicants fail to find a distinction between the claim recitations and the

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

recitation in the specification. For this reason, Applicants conclude that the Examiner's "fair reading" assessment of the claim is in error. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended independent claims 8 and 18 to be more consistent with the language contained in the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. In light of the above-cited amendment to independent claim 8, however, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 8-17 is moot. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 8 to further define features of the invention. Additionally, Applicants have also amended claim 18 to further define features of the invention.

In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.173(c), Applicants further provide the following explanation of the support in the disclosure of U.S. Patent No. 5,630,755 for amended claims 8 and 18. Support for claim 8 may be found, for example, at column 2, lines 31-67 and column 3, lines 1-42. Support for claim 18 may be found, for example, at column 3, lines 9-42.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucero.

Independent claim 8, recites a soft-count tracking system for a currency operated host gaming machine, comprising, among other things, an identification adapter having a unique serial number that is used to identify the host machine, and a currency note validator having a microcontroller capable of receiving identification information from the identification adapter.

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

In contrast, Lucero discloses a system having a portable transponder, which is merely used to display "jackpot" or payout information to an attendant. Lucero fails to teach or suggest that the transponder analyzes data. The Examiner argues that it is well known in the art for a game machine to have a currency-validator. However, even if the Examiner's assertion is true, there is no teaching or suggestion in Lucero, or the prior art, of a currency note validator capable of receiving identification information from the identification adapter as recited in the claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons cited in the preceding discussion, claim 8 is allowable. Because claims 9-17 depend from independent claim 8, Applicants submit that claims 9-17 are allowable for at least the same reasons given above.

Applicants further submit that claims 1-7 and 18-23 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 26, 2002

By: 

Jeanne M. Tanner  
Reg. No. 45,156

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com